UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/822,684	03/30/2001	David I. Poisner	42390P10577	9233

8791 7590 01/09/2006

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER	
CHEN, TSE W	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2116	

DATE MAILED: 01/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/822,684	POISNER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tse Chen	2116	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 November 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-8,13-20 and 25-30* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-5,8,13-17,20 and 25-29* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *6,7,18,19 and 30* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's submission filed on November 8, 2005 has been entered.

2. Claims 1-8, 13-20, and 25-30 are presented for examination. Applicant has canceled claims 9-12, 21-24, and 31-34.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wydall et al., US Patent 6117186, hereinafter Wydall, in view of Cromer et al., US Patent 6094720, hereinafter Cromer.

5. In re claim 1, Wydall discloses a method [col.7, ll.11-23] comprising:

- Configuring a mode [auto insert notification].
- Detecting insertion of a medium into a drive [cdrom] based on the mode.
- Starting a program [autorun.inf] on the medium when the insertion is detected.

6. Wydall did not disclose explicitly a configuration map stored in a non-volatile memory.

7. Cromer discloses a method comprising configuring a mode [configuration mode] in a configuration map [values mapped to the configuration in the broadest interpretation] stored in a non-volatile memory [nvram] during boot up [col.5, ll.1-13; col.8, l.59 – col.9, l.7].

8. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Wydall and Cromer before him at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the teachings of Cromer with the system disclosed by Wydall, as the non-volatile memory for storing a configuration map as taught by Cromer is a very well known concept for use with any configurable system. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination as it provides a very well known way to store configuration data in a non-volatile environment [Cromer: col.5, ll.1-13].

9. The Examiner has taken Official Notice that it is well known in the art to store and utilize a mode indicator in machine word format for processing efficiency.

10. Wydall and Cromer disclose each and every limitation of the claim, except that the mode is a word. However, mode indicators like other binary information are prevalently stored and utilized in machine word format for processing efficiency. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize mode words in the system disclosed by Wydall and Cromer. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination because of processing efficiency.

11. As to claim 13, Wydall and Cromer disclose the method as discussed above in reference to claim 1. Furthermore, Wydall discloses the computer program product comprising a machine useable medium [hard disk 8] having computer program code [operating system] embedded therein, the computer program product having computer readable program code to perform the method [col.5, l.55 – col.6, l.7].

12. Claims 2 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wydall and Cromer as applied to claims 1 and 13 above, and further in view of non-patent material

message-ID <marnoldDzIG2w.MqJ@netcom.com> submitted by Matt Arnold to newsgroup comp.os.ms-windows.programmer.misc, hereinafter Arnold.

13. Wydall and Cromer disclose each and every limitation of the claim as discussed above in reference to claims 1 and 13. Wydall and Cromer did not disclose explicitly configuring the mode word in one of multiple modes.

14. Arnold discloses a method comprising configuring a mode word in one of first, second, third, and fourth mode [e.g., DRIVE_REMOVABLE, DRIVE_REMOTE, DRIVE_CDROM, DRIVE_RAMDISK].

15. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Wydall, Cromer and Arnold before him at the time the invention was made, to use the multiple modes word disclosed by Arnold for the system disclosed by Wydall and Cromer as the multiple modes word taught by Arnold is a well known concept for use with any system with multiple modes. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination as it provides a way to indicate multiple different modes [Arnold].

16. Claims 3 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wydall, Cromer and Arnold as applied to claims 2 and 14 above, and further in view of non-patent material message-ID <01bda103$140c82e0$4ffk4ecl@pluto> submitted by Homecooking to newsgroup comp.publish.cdrom.hardware, hereinafter Homecooking.

17. Wydall, Cromer and Arnold disclose each and every limitation of the claim as discussed above in reference to claim 1. Wydall, Cromer and Arnold did not disclose explicitly periodically polling the drive.

18. Homecooking discloses a method wherein detecting the insertion comprises periodically polling [query] the drive when the mode word is configured in the first mode [auto insert notification] [detecting insertion automatically via querying inherently involves periodic timing as system does not know the exact time to query for insertion].

19. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Wydall, Cromer Arnold and Homecooking before him at the time the invention was made, to use the teachings of Homecooking as the periodic polling feature is a well-known feature for use with the system of Wydall, Cromer and Arnold. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination as it provides a way to detect the insertion of a medium [Homecooking].

20. Claims 4 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wydall, Cromer and Arnold as applied to claims 2 and 14 above, and further in view of McGee et al., US 5528566, hereinafter McGee, and Pletcher et al., US Patent 5694606, hereinafter Pletcher.

21. Wydall, Cromer and Arnold disclose each and every limitation of the claim as discussed above in reference to claims 2 and 14. Wydall, Cromer and Arnold did not disclose explicitly servicing an interrupt indicating the insertion of the medium when the mode is configured in one of multiple modes.

22. Regarding an interrupt indicating the insertion of the medium, McGee discloses a method wherein detecting the insertion comprises servicing an interrupt indicating the insertion of the medium [optical disc] [col.9, l.63 – col.10, l.19].

23. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Wydall, Cromer, Arnold and McGee before him at the time the invention was made, to use the

interrupt indicating the insertion of the medium as disclosed by McGee for the system disclosed by Wydall, Cromer and Arnold as the interrupt taught by McGee is a well known concept for use with the system of Wydall, Cromer, Arnold. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination as it provides a way to indicate the insertion of the medium.

24. Regarding servicing an interrupt in one of the multiple modes, Pletcher discloses the method that comprises servicing an interrupt when the mode is configured in one of multiple modes [processor modes] [col.4, ll.41 –58].

25. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Wydall, Cromer, Arnold, McGee and Pletcher before him at the time the invention was made, to include the teachings of Pletcher with the system disclosed by Wydall, Cromer, Arnold and McGee to provide the method wherein detecting the insertion comprises servicing an interrupt indicating the insertion of the medium when the mode is configured in one of a second, third, and fourth modes. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination as it provides a way to reduce interrupt handling overhead [Pletcher: col.4, ll.31-38].

26. Claims 5 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wydall, Cromer, McGee, Pletcher and Arnold as applied to claims 4 and 14 above, and further in view Benhase et al., US Patent 5463752, hereinafter Benhase.

27. Wydall, Cromer, McGee, Pletcher and Arnold disclose each and every limitation of the claim as discussed above in reference to claims 4 and 14. McGee discloses a polling circuit [optical sensor] detecting the insertion of the medium [disc] [col.9, l.63 – col.10, l.19; col.15,

ll.39-57]. Wydall, Cromer, McGee, Pletcher and Arnold did not discuss the details of the polling circuit.

28. Benhase discloses a method wherein servicing an interrupt comprises servicing the interrupt [signal] generated by a polling circuit in a chipset [independent polling means] [col.4, ll.24-32; col.4, l.50 – col.5, l.8].

29. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Wydall, Cromer, McGee, Pletcher, Arnold and Benhase before him at the time the invention was made, to include the teachings of Benhase with the system disclosed by Wydall, Cromer, McGee, Pletcher and Arnold to provide the method wherein servicing the interrupt comprises servicing the interrupt generated by a polling circuit in a chipset when the mode is configured in one of a second and third modes, the polling circuit detecting the insertion of the medium. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination as it provides a way to detect the insertion of the medium [McGee: col.9, l.63 – col.10, l.19] and free up some processor time for other activities [Benhase: col.2, ll.31-38].

30. Claims 8 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wydall, Cromer, Arnold, McGee and Pletcher as applied to claim 4 and 16 above, and further in view of Hoffman et al., US 5414858, hereinafter Hoffman.

31. Wydall, Cromer, Arnold, McGee and Pletcher disclose each and every limitation of the claim as discussed above in reference to claim 4 and 16. Wydall, Cromer, Arnold, McGee and Pletcher did not discuss servicing the interrupt generated by the drive.

32. Hoffman discloses a method wherein servicing an interrupt comprises servicing an interrupt generated by a drive [device] [fig.3].

33. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Hoffman, Wydall, Cromer, Arnold, McGee and Pletcher before him at the time the invention was made, to include the teachings of Hoffman with the system disclosed by Wydall, Cromer, Arnold, McGee and Pletcher to provide the method of claim 4 wherein servicing the interrupt comprises servicing the interrupt generated by the drive. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination as it provides an efficient way to operate a system with peripheral devices by utilizing multiple modes based on interrupt and polling mechanisms [Hoffman: col.2, ll.1-12; set mode to either interrupt or polling to match the expected latency in order to increase efficiency].

34. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wydall and Cromer as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Sarkarda, US Patent 6189050.

35. Wydall and Cromer disclose each and every limitation of the claim as discussed above in reference to claim 1. In particular, Wydall discloses a system [fig.1] comprising:

- A processor [4].
- A memory [disk 8] coupled to the processor to store instruction code [operating system], the instruction code, when executed by the processor, causing the processor to execute the method discussed above in reference to claim 1 [col.5, l.55 – col.6, l.7].

36. Wydall and Cromer did not discuss a chipset to control the drive.

37. Sarkarda discloses a system [100] comprising:

- A chipset [pci/ide bus controller] coupled to the processor to control a drive [floppy disk device 112] [col.5, ll.11-24].

38. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Wydall, Cromer and Sarkada before him at the time the invention was made, to include the teachings of Sarkada with the system disclosed by Wydall and Cromer to provide the system of claim 25. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination as it provides an efficient way to detect an insertion of a medium and take appropriate actions in response to the detection [Sakarda: col.4, ll.52-65; Sarkarda would increase the efficiency of Wydall with a separate control chip to service the drive].

39. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wydall, Cromer and Sarkada as applied to claim 25 above, and further in view of Arnold.

40. Wydall, Cromer and Sarkada disclose each and every limitation of the claim as discussed above in reference to claim 25. Wydall, Cromer and Sarkada did not disclose explicitly configuring the mode word in one of multiple modes.

41. Arnold discloses a method comprising configuring a mode word in one of first, second, third, and fourth mode [e.g., DRIVE_REMOVABLE, DRIVE_REMOTE, DRIVE_CDROM, DRIVE_RAMDISK].

42. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Wydall, Cromer, Sarkada and Arnold before him at the time the invention was made, to use the multiple modes word disclosed by Arnold for system disclosed by Wydall, Cromer and Sarkada as the multiple modes word taught by Arnold is a well known concept for use with any system with multiple modes. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination as it provides a way to indicate multiple different modes [Arnold].

43. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wydall, Cromer, Arnold and Sarkada as applied to claim 26 above, and further in view of Homecooking.

44. Wydall, Cromer, Arnold and Sarkada disclose each and every limitation of the claim as discussed above in reference to claim 26. Wydall, Cromer, Arnold and Sarkada did not disclose explicitly periodically polling the drive.

45. Homecooking discloses a method wherein detecting the insertion comprises periodically polling [query] the drive when the mode word is configured in the first mode [auto insert notification].

46. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Wydall, Cromer, Arnold, Sarkada and Homecooking before him at the time the invention was made, to use the teachings of Homecooking as the periodic polling feature is a well-known feature for use with the system of Wydall, Cromer, Arnold and Sarkada. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination as it provides a way to detect the insertion of a medium [Homecooking].

47. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wydall, Cromer, Sarkada, and Arnold as applied to claim 26 above, and further in view of McGee and Pletcher.

48. Wydall, Cromer, Sarkada, and Arnold disclose each and every limitation of the claim as discussed above in reference to claim 26. Wydall, Cromer, Sarkada, and Arnold did not disclose explicitly servicing an interrupt indicating the insertion of the medium when the mode is configured in one of multiple modes.

49. Regarding an interrupt indicating the insertion of the medium, McGee discloses a method wherein detecting the insertion comprises servicing an interrupt indicating the insertion of the medium [optical disc] [col.9, l.63 – col.10, l.19].

50. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Wydall, Cromer, Sarkada, Arnold and McGee before him at the time the invention was made, to use the interrupt indicating the insertion of the medium as disclosed by McGee for the system disclosed by Wydall, Cromer, Sarkada, and Arnold as the interrupt taught by McGee is a well known concept for use with the system of Wydall, Cromer, Sarkada, and Arnold. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination as it provides a way to indicate the insertion of the medium.

51. Regarding servicing an interrupt in one of the multiple modes, Pletcher discloses the method that comprises servicing an interrupt when the mode is configured in one of multiple modes [processor modes] [col.4, ll.41 –58].

52. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Wydall, Cromer, Sarkada, Arnold, McGee and Pletcher before him at the time the invention was made, to include the teachings of Pletcher with the system disclosed by Wydall, Cromer, Sarkada, Arnold and McGee to provide the method wherein detecting the insertion comprises servicing an interrupt indicating the insertion of the medium when the mode is configured in one of a second, third, and fourth modes. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination as it provides a way to reduce interrupt handling overhead [Pletcher: col.4, ll.31-38]

53. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wydall, Cromer, Sarkada, Arnold, McGee and Pletcher as applied to claim 28 above, and further in view of Benhase.

54. Wydall, Cromer, Sarkada, Arnold, McGee and Pletcher disclose each and every limitation of the claim as discussed above in reference to claims 28. McGee discloses a polling circuit [optical sensor] detecting the insertion of the medium [disc] [col.9, l.63 – col.10, l.19; col.15, ll.39-57]. Wydall, Cromer, Sarkada, Arnold, McGee and Pletcher did not discuss the details of a polling circuit.

55. Benhase discloses a method wherein servicing an interrupt comprises servicing the interrupt [signal] generated by a polling circuit in a chipset [independent polling means] [col.4, ll.24-32; col.4, l.50 – col.5, l.8].

56. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Wydall, Cromer, Sarkada, Arnold, McGee, Pletcher and Benhase before him at the time the invention was made, to include the teachings of Benhase with the system disclosed by Wydall, Cromer, Sarkada, Arnold, McGee and Pletcher to provide the method wherein servicing the interrupt comprises servicing the interrupt generated by a polling circuit in a chipset when the mode is configured in one of a second and third modes, the polling circuit detecting the insertion of the medium. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination as it provides a way to detect the insertion of the medium [McGee: col.9, l.63 – col.10, l.19] and free up some processor time for other activities [Benhase: col.2, ll.31-38].

Allowable Subject Matter

57. Claims 6-7, 18-19 and 30 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

58. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the claims may be allowable because none of the references cited, either alone or in combination discloses or renders obvious a method of claim 5, a computer program product of claim 17, and a system of claim 29, wherein "servicing the interrupt comprises checking a status bit set by the polling circuit when the mode is configured in the second mode, updating a flag in a memory based on the status bit, and responding to a poll request by an operating system".

Response to Arguments

59. All rejections of claim limitations as filed prior to Amendment dated November 8, 2005 not argued in entirety or substantively in response filed as said Amendment have been conceded by Applicant and the rejections are maintained from henceforth. Any arguments hereinafter related to said rejections of claim limitations will be considered untimely.

60. Applicant's arguments dated November 8, 2005, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

61. Generally, Applicant alleges that the cited references do not "disclose, suggest, or render obvious" the claimed method, system and product. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, Examiner submits that one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references.

62. Applicant alleges that Wydall does not disclose "detecting insertion of a medium into a drive based on the mode". Examiner disagrees and submits that Arnold does disclose detecting insertion of a medium into a drive [cdrom] based on the mode [auto insert notification].

63. Applicant alleges that Arnold "does not disclose, suggest, or render obvious ... configuring the mode word in one of first, second, third, and fourth modes". Applicant supports the allegation by asserting that Arnold "merely discloses setting a bit in the bitmask ... prevent user from using Autoplay with the corresponding drive type... this is not the same as configuring the mode word in one of first, second, third, and fourth modes". Examiner disagrees and submits that Arnold does disclose configuring the mode word in one of first, second, third, and fourth modes in that Examiner is entitled to interpret the bits in the broadest interpretation as representing modes and apply Arnold accordingly.

64. Applicant alleges that Homecooking does "not disclose, suggest, or render obvious ... detecting the insertion comprising periodically polling the drive when the mode word is configured in the first mode". Examiner disagrees and submits Homecooking's rather short but concise disclosure in entirety to note that Homecooking explicitly describes the unpleasant situation of "what happens when you've got the [auto] insert notification on ***when burning a disk***... Windows queries the drive and ***interrupts*** the read and/or writing process..."

65. Applicant alleges that McGee "merely discloses that the microprocessor periodically polls each read-head modules optical sensor pair, not a polling circuit in a chipset... polling by a microprocessor is a software technique". Examiner notes that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., polling not by software technique) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not

read into the claims. Applicant should explicitly point to where in the specification such feature is indicated for support.

66. Applicant alleges that Benhase "merely discloses using a separate microprocessor to implement an independent polling function, not a polling circuit in a chipset." Examiner disagrees and submits that Benhase does disclose servicing an interrupt comprises servicing the interrupt [signal] generated by a polling circuit in a chipset [independent polling means] [col.4, ll.24-32; col.4, l.50 – col.5, l.8].

67. Applicant made a general allegation that Examiner "failed to show there is teaching, suggestion or motivation to combine the references" without pointing out to any particular instances. Examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. Applicant should support the allegation by specifically pointing out which teaching, suggestion, or motivation cited did not come from either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art.

68. As demonstrated above and in previous responses to similar arguments, Applicant's arguments are not persuasive and the rejections are thus maintained.

Conclusion

69. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tse Chen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3672. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9AM - 5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynne Browne can be reached on (571) 272-3670. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tse Chen
December 23, 2005

LYNNE H. BROWNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100